Case 1:16-cr-00019-PGG Document 23 Filed 08/11/16 Page 1 of 11

G76JJONC Conference UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 -----x 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 16 Cr. 00019 PGG v. MAALIK ALIM JONES, 5 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 9 July 6, 2016 10:16 a.m. 10 11 12 Before: 13 HON. PAUL G. GARDEPHE, 14 District Judge 15 16 **APPEARANCES** 17 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 18 ANDREW JAMES DeFILIPPIS, 19 SEAN STEPHEN BUCKLEY, Assistant United States Attorneys 20 THE LAW OFFICES OF SEAN M. MAHER, PPLC, 21 Attorneys for defendant Jones BY: SEAN MICHAEL MAHER, Esq. 22 Of counsel 23 Also Present: MARY BOESE, Special Agent FBI 24 25

1 (In open court)

(Case called)

THE COURT: Mr. DeFilippis, what is the status of discovery?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: At this time, the government has completed its Rule 16 discovery and produced it to defense counsel, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Maher, what is your sense of what the future of the case is going to be?

MR. MAHER: As far as Rule 16, the last two discs were produced I believe on June 17th, about two weeks ago. There is an encryption issue we are still looking into, but I don't think it will hold us up in any way.

The way I see it, the government informed the court it intends to file a CIPA filing with the court, and it is a CIPA filing the government says will not be shared with defense counsel at all. I am cleared counsel. I have gone through that, all the levels I think I need for this type of case, but I don't know what the government is filing. I would like the opportunity to file my own application to the court regarding the government's ex-parte application.

In addition, there is an additional discovery demand that I intend to make on the government which may implicate classified information with the government, and that will be for the government to decide. I think the most prudent thing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at this point would be to give me a little bit of time to do that. I have talked with the government. I think the government was going to file in the first week of August. If we could come back the week I believe of August 15th, I will file my CIPA filing with the court before that and also make my discovery demands on the government, and I think the government anticipates they could at least give us a shorthand answer as to where they think that leaves the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Maher, has some of the discovery you've received so far, has that been redacted in some fashion or not?

MR. MAHER: There are, off the top of my head, I think there are some redactions. I am thinking about other things that aren't in the Rule 16, but I think may be out in the universe.

THE COURT: Let me talk with the government just a second about how the CIPA process is going to work.

As I understand it, the government is going to be making a filing on August 5th, and that filing is going to tell me that certain materials were withheld, certain materials that the defendant would otherwise be entitled to under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure have been withheld because they constitute classified information.

Is that the process?

MR. DeFilippis: Your Honor, we do intend to make a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

filing in which we seek the court's permission to withhold from discovery material that not necessarily would be discoverable under Rule 16, but that in an abundance of caution the government could see an argument it would be. That is the purpose of the motion, is to request that the court allow it to withhold from discovery those materials.

THE COURT: Okay. And so, Mr. Maher, this filing that you would make, you don't really know what they've withheld, but you have got suspicions about what they withheld. Is that what you're going to be addressing?

MR. MAHER: At this point, I anticipate two things that I will be addressing:

One, I want to address the CIPA statute, particularly the provision that permits the government to make ex-parte I can understand applications when there is cleared counsel. potentially when there is uncleared counsel, but when we have cleared counsel and have criminal penalties such as myself if we did anything to reveal that information, I think that the constitutional protections for my client outweigh the government's need for secrecy in those limited instances. That. is one aspect I would like to file with the court.

Then there are particularized requests that go beyond the Rule 16 that have been provided to me that I would like to make to the government, and I can't anticipate how they would respond, so I don't really want to do that. I will defer that,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. DeFilippis, I am hearing from Mr.

Maher he has been through some kind of classified

information-clearance process. How does that impact what we are going to be doing here?

MR. DeFilippis: Your Honor, we understand that he has been through that process. However, the statute, Section 4 of CIPA, specifically contemplates and prescribes the filings are made ex-parte. The case law supports that. We are not aware of cases in which it has been otherwise.

We don't see anything at all atypical or unusual about this case that we think would warrant revisiting that or contemplating any other outcome.

I would note, with regard to the Rule 16 discovery which is complete, we did scour all of our usual sources, both classified and unclassified, and any redactions in the discovery were not redactions of classified material. They were for other reasons, but in our view, there is no classified discovery that should be produced to defense counsel in this case.

THE COURT: All right. I will await the government's submission and Mr. Maher's submission, and I am going to put it down for a conference on August 16th, at 10:30, to discuss these matters further.

MR. MAHER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Is there an problem with August 16th, at 10:30?

MR. DeFilippis: Not from the government. We ask your Honor order defense counsel to make its discovery request within two weeks of today so we have time to address it before the conference.

THE COURT: Mr. Maher, when can you get your discovery request in, or the matters that you were mentioning you wanted to ask the government about?

MR. MAHER: The specific discovery request, if I could have, I would ask three weeks, July 27th.

MR. DeFilippis: That is fine with the government.

THE COURT: July 27th for the discovery requests, and when are you going to make your application, Mr. Maher, related to CIPA? Are you going to do that on the 27th as well?

MR. MAHER: I would ask for more time.

THE COURT: You want more time on that?

Well, yes, I guess the government is not filing their application until the 5th, so does it make sense to have yours due on the 5th as well?

MR. MAHER: That should make sense. I would still ask if I could have the 12th for that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That doesn't give us a lot of time before the conference, but so the schedule is July 27th for discovery requests, August 5th for the government's CIPA

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

filing, August 12th for whatever application Mr. Maher is going to make about CIPA, and August 16th for the conference at 10:30. Does the government wish me to exclude time between now and August 16th?

MR. DeFilippis: Yes, your Honor, so defense counsel can continue to review discovery and prepare its motions, we believe it is in the interests of justice.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Maher?

MR. MAHER: No, your Honor. There is one matter I do want to bring up.

> THE COURT: All right.

MR. MAHER: That has to do with Mr. Jones' pretrial conditions at the MCC. He has been incarcerated since December 18th, 2015 here in Manhattan. He has been in the Special Housing Unit the entire time. It is my understanding basically since after the first month of his incarceration he has been in the 10 South unit, which is the most severe restrictive pretrial detention conditions probably in the country.

He is basically in solitary confinement and has been treated as if he were under special administrative measures, though such measures have never been implemented. I have brought this up to the government, and I think the government stated to me they believe the SAM may be approved very quickly. I don't want to put words in their mouth.

THE COURT: Who wants to address this for the

government, Mr. DeFilippis?

MR. DeFilippis: Yes, your Honor.

As the defense counsel stated, there is a request for Special Administrative Measures pending which we expect will come through subject to the approvals in Washington quite soon. We think it is likely it will be in place before the next conference. The defendant's conditions of detention to date have been based on the BOP's constant evaluation both of the charges in this case, the nature of the defendant's alleged conduct, and the security requirements at the MCC where he is housed.

We have been in regular communication with the BOP, and given the charges in this case, your Honor, which allege that the defendant traveled to join an Al Qaeda aligned terrorist group and received military training from them, the BOP's determination to date, and U.S. Attorney's Office agrees, the determination has been his current conditions are appropriate, and we continue to believe they are.

THE COURT: All right. Let me say this to you, Mr. Maher. If you continue to believe that the conditions of Mr. Jones' pretrial detention are improper, you are welcome to make a written submission, and then I will hear from the government on it.

Mr. DeFilippis, with respect to these SAM measures that you were talking about, tell me what that whole process is

0,0000110

and what you expect to happen. I think you said you expected some developments in that?

MR. DeFilippis: Yes, your Honor.

The request for the imposition of Special

Administrative Measures, which comes from the U.S. Attorney,
goes through various chains of approval in Washington. That is
now in progress. If and when they're approved, which we expect
they will be, it will essentially formalize and continue his
current conditions of confinement, again subject to the BOP and
DOJ consulting on any issues.

THE COURT: Is that a Main Justice process you're talking about, you have to send something down to Main Justice and have them approval it?

MR. DeFilippis: That's right, your Honor, that is a decision that is made at headquarters.

THE COURT: So that would make formal what up till now has been an informal imposition of restraints on the defendant pursuant I guess to a Bureau of Prisons policy?

MR. DeFilippis: Yes, your Honor. They are approved by the Attorney General. I don't know that the word "informal" is right. The BOP makes it its own determination of the appropriate conditions. We are able to formally request Special Administrative Measures, but you're right, that it would essentially continue those conditions. We have informed the BOP previously of our intention to seek the imposition of

SAMS and have described for them our rationale in doing so.

THE COURT: Does Main Justice issue some kind of written findings?

MR. DeFilippis: Yes, there will be a memorandum with actual procedures and administrative measures that would state the basis for the imposition of them and the specific requirements.

THE COURT: When do you expect that to come through?

MR. DeFILIPPIS: I wouldn't wouldn't to promise. We are optimistic it will be in place before our next conference.

THE COURT: As I said Mr. Maher, it is up to you how you wish to proceed on that. If you want to make a submission, I will be happy to consider it. If you want to await what Main Justice decides with respect to the SAM measures that Mr. DeFilippis has told us about, you can take that approach, either. It is entirely up to you when you seek to raise the issue.

I am aware of the charges against the defendant, and they certainly suggest that special measures are necessary, but I am not prejudging the issue and you're welcome to make any application you wish.

MR. MAHER: Thank you. I am appreciating that.

THE COURT: I will exclude time between today and August 16th, our next conference, pursuant to Title 18 United States Code Section 3161 (h)(7)(A), to permit defense counsel

G76JJONC

to continue review of discovery, also to make application with respect to the Classified Information Procedures Act, and also to consider whether there will be any pretrial motions in the case and what the future of the case will be. I do find that the ends of justice served by the granting of this continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

Is there anything else we need to talk about today?

MR. DeFilippis: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. MAHER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Court adjourned)